

PROPOSAL EVALUATION
IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Contra Costa Water District	County	Contra Costa
Project Title	East Contra Costa County Prop 84 Planning Grant Application	Grant Request	\$449,843
		Total Project Cost	\$600,000

Project Description The East Contra Costa County IRWM Region is proposing to update their existing Functionally Equivalent IRWM Plan (FEP) to a fully-integrated regional water management plan that meets current Plan Standards, that fully addresses the Region's needs and water resource management objectives, and that provides appropriate solutions to addressing regional water conflicts. The region is also proposing to: develop a conceptual model of groundwater use in the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin, conduct a data gap analysis to identify the safe yield of the portion of the Tracy Groundwater Subbasin underlying the East County Region, and develop a Salt/Nutrient Management Program for the Pittsburg Plain Groundwater Basin.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	8
Budget	6
Program Preferences	7
Geographic Balance	0
Total Score	41

- **Work Plan** The background section of the work plan details the IRWM planning efforts accomplished to date. Deficiencies in the current plan and the revisions required are identified. The proposed work plan lacked specificity, particularly section 1.2 where the work plan lacked thorough documentation and sufficient rationale to support a higher score. The need for the groundwater management program and salt/nutrient management program was not readily apparent given the little detail regarding Resource Management Strategies and how they were or were not addressed in the functionally equivalent plan.
- **DAC Involvement** DACs will be further outreached in future planning. Subtask 5.2 intends to "identify, contact, and inform" DACs using 2010 Census data. There is no explanation of how the DACs will be contacted or how the DAC projects will be included in the plan.
- **Schedule** The schedule fully addresses the criterion but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The work plan lacks specifics, making it difficult to determine whether the times given in the schedule are reasonable.
- **Budget** The budget less than fully addresses the criterion and documentation is incomplete. For example, there is no hour estimate, or rationale, for the total cost of each Subtask. For Task 1 it is unclear how the budgeted total costs for Subtask 1.1 - 1.4 equal the consultant's estimated fee in light of a claim of funding match in the form of cash and in-kind service.
- **Program Preference** Seven program preferences (Include regional projects/programs, effectively integrate water management programs and projects, drought preparedness, use and reuse water more efficiently, practice integrated flood management, protect surface water and groundwater quality, climate change response actions) were adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable